

Vault
M22.1
P445
m3

PROPHETIC CONTROVERSY NO. 5.

CHAPTER I.

LYONS, WIS., Nov. 20, 1901.

MR. HEMAN C. SMITH:

DEAR SIR — Yours of Nov. 6th is at hand and duly considered and I have thought that a line in answer might not be out of place, and might perhaps interest you. I am especially interested in what you say touching some things which Mr. Strang taught, some of which you say you can indorse, but have your reasons for rejecting his claims, and some other things he taught.

I believe I can endorse anything that is reasonable and just wherever I find it, even though it be against some of my cherished principles, if any such thing there be. I am no stronger in the faith of Mr. Strang's claims and revelations, than I once was in the faith of the Church of England.

But the truths of Mormonism upset that faith, and it has long since vanished from me forever and ever. Simply because truth is a mighty thing and *it will prevail*. It is very mighty in crushing unsound creeds founded only in the wisdom of men or devils.

Mormonism has knocked the creeds of christendom into hopeless ruins, and so it goes on conquering, and to conquer, until everything not based on truth is crushed to rise no more. And of course Mr. Strang's creed is no exception to the general mass, if it so be that it has in it anything not founded on truth, or the word of God, which is eternal truth, or eternal certainty and safety.

Knowing just so much, I have no use for any principle that won't stand the test of truth. I am under no obligation to follow Mr. Strang or anybody else, whose faith is not founded in truth and righteousness. But one thing I will say touching the revelations of Mr. Strang

—there is no unrighteousness in them. There is nothing in them but what the revelations of God, through Joseph call for, and all other prophets of God *will sustain*. Second, there is nothing that has ever yet been said against them that, carried to their legitimate results, would not overthrow the claims of any and all other prophets of God. Third, there is nothing that has been said against the claims, and revelations of Mr. Strang that is not at least ten times harder to be believed by a reasonable man, than any claim he has ever made. The same was true of the claims of Joseph Smith. Fourth, the very things which seem the strongest against him, *on examination, turn out to be the strongest in his favor*. The same was true of Joseph Smith. These things are not true of false prophets; anything but that. As with the precious metals, and precious stones, the more you test them, the brighter they shine. The works of false prophets thrive best by being let alone. The more the works of a true prophet are opposed, the more they prosper and prevail. Test the works of a false prophet by the word of God, and they crumble to nothing at once. But test the claims of a true prophet and you only establish them.

The above are the conclusions I have arrived at from the study and investigation of the claims of both Joseph Smith and James J. Strang. And I am confident that all men who investigate those claims will arrive at the same conclusions. "Strang's claims are the only ones that fill the bill," is a remark often made by those who have no great faith in Mormonism, as well as by those who have. Here are the points:

1st. God by oath and promise assured the Latter Day Saints, through

Joseph, that he would plant one in Joseph's stead. How? By Revelation, as: "I have given him (Joseph) the keys of the mysteries and the revelations WHICH ARE SEALED, UNTIL I (God) shall appoint unto them (the church) another in his stead." This saying, short as it is, has two very important points in it. 1st, That God would fill Joseph's place by another, and 2nd, That when the *appointment was made*, that Joseph would *cease* to be a revelator, a seer, a translator and a prophet to the church, and that these gifts would pass immediately from the appointment, to the one appointed! O my dear sir, here are two very grand and startling truths.

Why did Joseph the Seer continue for so many years to exercise the gifts and keys of his office, after appointing his son Joseph as you say he did, in Missouri to succeed him? Yes, and how is it that the one appointed has not put forth *some* evidence of being put in possession of these prophetic gifts and keys, though it is now somewhere about sixty years since that appointment was, as you say, made? Why is it that, while the Almighty has decreed that the sealed records are to go down from one prophet to another, from generation to generation, that young Joseph has never either seen or hefted these records, and knows nothing as to whose hands they are in? Does he know any more about them than the simplest convert made yesterday? What has he ever done in the last *fifty* years to merit the title of "*prophet, seer, revelator and translator*," or to prove that he has "all the gifts which God bestows upon the *head* of the church," or that he is even the shadow of being a prophet like unto Moses? "The duty of the president of the office of the high priesthood is to be *like unto Moses*." Why should *he* be like unto Moses? Because he is ordained to all the gifts, keys, prerogatives and privil-

eges to which Moses was ordained, and he has nothing to do but to exercise those gifts, keys, etc., as Moses did, according to the mind and will of God. For "this *greater* priesthood administers the gospel, and **HOLDETH THE KEY of the mysteries of the kingdom**, even the *key of the knowledge of God*." Now this "*greater* priesthood" is simply the office held by Joseph the Seer, and is after the *holiest* order of God." (Sec. 83:3) Again: "Joseph Smith, Jr., unto whom I have given the keys of the kingdom, which **BELONG ALWAYS** unto the Presidency of the High priesthood." (Doc. and Cov., Sec. 80:1.) What was there to hinder young Joseph from exercising the keys, gifts and powers of his priesthood, during these last sixty years, if he really ever held that office?

Does God confer prophetic gifts, keys and priesthood upon men which are never to be used or exercised? Joseph the Seer enquired the mind of the Lord, when but one, two, three and six, and other small numbers desired it, and was answered; but four or six thousand of the honest in heart in the ranks of young Joseph might desire, pray for, and request any one of the mysteries of the kingdom of God, to be opened or revealed, but young Joseph gets no knowledge of any such mysteries, any more than the simplest elder in his church.

In looking at these things in the spirit of reason and truth, does it need the wisdom of a Solomon to shew that young Joseph Smith was *never* either called through his father, or ordained and anointed by proper authority to fill his father's office? Does it need such wisdom to shew that he has been made the tool of a set of aspiring and conspiring enthusiasts and fanatics, in claiming an appointment and office to which he was never lawfully called or ordained to fill?

"The president of the church * * is appointed by revelation." (Doc. and Cov. 99:6.) Now if the Almighty did not appoint a *legal* and *truly authorized source*, through which this appointing revelation is to come, then Mormonism proves itself to be the most insane embodiment of nonsense and confusion upon which any corporate body was ever founded. A single glance at the results following the death of Joseph Smith is enough to convince any thinking man of the truth of this.

Look at the number who arose then, one here with *his* revelation, and another there with *his* vision, and another yonder with *his* revelation, each calling the saints after himself, and no two of them alike. Thus it was with some dozen at least of would-be revelators to the church. J. C. Brewster, Oliver Olney, Gladden Bishop, Sidney Rigdon, Jason W. Briggs, William E. McLellan, Elijah Swackhammer, William Smith, Chas. B. Thompson, David Whitmer, Granville Hedrick, Zenos H. Gurley, E. C. Briggs, W. Bickerton, and I cannot remember just how many more. I think I once made out a list of something like twenty-five, but can't call them all to mind now. God foresaw this state of things, and hence made provision in his law to detect all these monstrous and blundering upstarts and deceivers, and made the way so plain that even a fool might detect and avoid them, with ease and precision. Here is the provision. It is that no one should be appointed in Joseph Smith's stead as a revelator and lawgiver *to the church* except by direct revelation from God, given through Joseph Smith, the prophet and seer. Here is the language: "But verily, verily I say unto you that none else shall be appointed unto this gift except it be *through him*" (Joseph), and God made this a law to the saints forbidding them to receive any revelation through any one else, only

him who is thus appointed, lest they be deceived, and that they might *know* that whosoever was not so appointed was not of God. (Doc. and Cov., sec. 43:2 and sec. 99:6.)

Now it is enough to say here that, if the church, or even a considerable part of it, had paid attention to these words, no Brigham Young, nor any other self-constituted revelator to the church, could ever have gained the slightest power over them to deceive or mislead them. They would have every one fallen before them as grass before the scythe, and would have been consigned in short order to their own place, among the false prophets and deceivers of the past.

Had they all acted like Bishop George Miller and some others, who *demand*ed to know whom Joseph had appointed, and refused to follow any until that fact was made known to them, none would have been deceived. Mr. Strang being the only man who presented just such an appointment, just such a revelation as this law calls for, and just in the *proper time too*, we have no difficulty in consigning *all* who come short of it, to their own place as stated above. But supposing that Mr. Strang had failed also to produce this appointing revelation through Joseph, he would then be on a level with all the other aspirants, and the attempt to point out any one of these as the true leader would only add to the confusion, for no man or set of men would be capable of bringing order out of any such chaos. And now, what are those men now doing who are fighting and opposing Mr. Strang's appointment? They are simply aiming to destroy the foundation upon which pure Mormonism rests. They are simply in the act of trying to prove Joseph the Seer a false prophet. I have often thought that if Clark Braden understood the principles upon which Mr. Strang's claims are based, and the monstrous

folly upon which the Reorganized church is based, he could use some arguments against that church with mighty telling effect. He would ignore Mr. Strang of course, but he could most effectually show that the promises of God, which he made to that church, that he would plant another in Joseph's stead, have not been fulfilled, and that all these things are a positive failure and a humbug. He could parade young Joseph's own ignorance, set forth in his biography, of any such call for full sixteen years after the death of his father, and could show beyond question that he is also destitute of the prophetic gifts and keys and prerogatives. He could demonstrate that the claim that the prophetic office goes by lineal right is utterly false! In a word he could literally drive the champions of young Josephism in disgrace from the field of argument, and could win a name and a fame as an anti-Mormon champion, such as no other opposer of Mormonism has ever won. If you think that the Clark Bradens will not find out this weak spot, this rottenness in the claims set up for young Joseph, some day you are mightily deceived.

Now you say in your letter that "you have your reasons for rejecting Mr. Strang's claims to the successorship, and some of the doctrines which he taught." So far as we are concerned, we can only look upon this remark as equivalent to saying that Joseph Smith had no lawful successor in the prophetic office, for we have demonstrated by the law and testimony of heaven, and by young Joseph's own words, and from every line of his history, that he never was either lawfully called, or lawfully ordained to any such office, for every line of his history gives the lie to any such claim. And to call any such man a prophet of the Most High God is the merest blasphemy, for it really does profane the character of God to teach that

such a man is a prophet like unto Moses, or any other prophet of that order, or grade of priesthood. If I could once get it into my mind that young Joseph Smith is a prophet like unto Moses, or like any other prophet of that order or grade of priesthood, as Melchizedec, Elijah, Elisha, or Isaiah, or Jeremiah, or Peter, James and John, or Joseph the Seer, it would greatly lessen my estimation of such prophets, and in fact of the God who sent them. But in heaven's name, if you have any *sound reasons* for rejecting Mr. Strang's claims, as Joseph Smith's lawfully called and anointed successor, don't keep them in the dark; that is, if you have any reasons for rejecting Mr. Strang's claims sound enough, so that they will not equally justify me and all others in rejecting all the prophets which God has sent since the world began, in the name of truth I say let us have them, *privately or publicly*, it does not matter. If you really have any such reasons, however, I would prefer that you publish them in the columns of the Saints' Herald, and then invite his followers to defend Mr. Strang, if they can. That would certainly be the most just and proper way to do it. If you persist, as the Herald has always done heretofore, in publishing the statements of Mr. Strang's meanest enemies, and shut out any defense that can be made in his behalf, that is a principle that stamps you as a sectarian priest at once. There is no frank, open manliness about it. It looks a good deal like saying vile things of a man and then grabbing him by the throat to prevent him from defending himself.

Mr. Strang was a member of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in good standing at the time of Joseph Smith's death, baptized and confirmed by Joseph Smith himself, and ordained an elder under the hands of Hyrum Smith some six months before

their martyrdom. If Mr. Strang had been charged with any misdemeanor against the rules of the church at that time, or the laws of the land, then the proper thing to have done with him was to call him to account according to the discipline of the church, which has in itself most excellent rules for trying and disposing of all evil doers and transgressors of God's law or man's law. Anyone who will read carefully the "Minutes of the Organization of the High Council of the Church in Doctrine and Covenants," and the purposes for which it was intended and established, must see that there was no chance for Mr. Strang to palm himself off as an imposter upon the church, provided it were his wish to do so, if the required and proper steps had been taken with him. But they were not. The usurping Twelve, who assumed the reins of the church at that time, did not want him to be tried according to the laws of the church. They were too well satisfied that the trial would have resulted in his favor. Hence John Taylor thought the best way to get rid of one who was in his way to self-exaltation and usurped power was to cut him off from the church without trial, and circulate the basest falsehoods against him.

Here is their edict:

"TO THE SAINTS."

Whereas, Elders James J. Strang and Aaron Smith have been circulating a 'revelation' (falsely called) purporting to have been received by Joseph Smith on the 18th of June, 1844, and through the influence of which they *have* attempted, and are attempting to establish a stake, called Voree, in Wisconsin Territory, thereby leading the saints astray, therefore the said James J. Strang and Aaron Smith are cut off from the church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, this 26th day of August, 1844.

By order of the Council of the Twelve.

"W. RICHARDS, Clerk."

See Times and Seasons, Vol. 5, page 631.

Neither Mr. Strang nor Aaron Smith were ever called upon to answer any charges preferred against them, and this is the kind of proceedings had against Mr. Strang from that day to this, both from Brighamites and Josephites. Every foul story which the foulest enemy was capable of hatching up against him, and then taking pains to shut out his defense, has been the common rule of procedure by all. Yes, evil-speaking slander and falsehood—the blackest and foulest stories, the common lot of all the prophets of God in every age, have been heaped unsparingly upon him, from soon after his ordination under the hands of angels at the death of Joseph, until this day. Yet the letter of appointment was just what it *ought to be* to meet the requirements of God's promises to the church through Joseph the Seer, and just such claims as Mr. Strang made were just the claims that he *ought to have made*. The land pointed out in that letter for the gathering of the saints has long since been proved as the letter says it was: "very good." The people there and the owners of the land were to show the saints' kindness, and they did, and do to this day. It is the only gathering place where the Mormons or Latter Day Saints have not been driven from. To be sure everything in that letter is not yet fulfilled.

God promises there that he will have a house built unto him in Voree. He said afterward that it should be built in *this* generation, and that in that house he would "then shew himself to his people by many mighty works." God made very similar promises to Joseph in Missouri, but that house in Missouri is not yet built. Moreover there are many things spoken to the people under Joseph the Seer that are none of

them fulfilled yet. But all Mormons look for them to be fulfilled in *this* generation, and all know if they are not that there is then an *end of Mormonism!* And of course Strangism goes along with it. Yes, Strangism goes along with it, and both go together beyond the possibility of redemption, because these promises are unconditional, fixed and certain. Again that letter—registered at Nauvoo as it was—came in the best known way; went to the distributing post office at Chicago; was recorded there, as all such letters are and should be. It was received at Burlington, Wisconsin, and was recorded there, as all such letters should be. It was carried from there by one of the first citizens of the place, Mr. C. P. Barnes, a distinguished lawyer there, and presented to Mr. Strang, with the request that if there was any news of public interest in it that he might be informed of it, and Mr. Strang then and there sat down and read that letter in his presence, and also in the presence of Aaron Smith, a high priest on a mission there from Nauvoo, and in the best of standing in the church, and who was also a witness to the sending of Mr. Strang's letter to Joseph Smith, to which the letter of appointment is the answer. Now we claim that this letter came in just such a way as *it ought to have come*, and all the objections made to it as genuine are the merest criminal pettifogging; the merest childish quibbling and folly. "If evil befall me thou (J. J. Strang) shall lead the flock to *pleasant pastures*." And surely these pastures were pleasant. No lands could be better supplied. At any rate, taking them all round, no lands were better adapted to the wants of man—lands of pure water, pure air, excellent health, the riches of the land, of the forest and of the waters, for meadows, for grain, and for all kinds of fruit peculiar to those northern latitudes, for timber, and for stone, and for brick, etc.

CHAPTER II.

Now the Reorganized leaders look upon plural marriages as something that discharges them from all obligation to either follow or receive the teachings or testimonies of any man as a prophet of God, no matter how well and overwhelmingly he may be able to sustain his claims to that office or calling. But I think in my letter which you have just answered I have made it pretty clear that if that principle could once be established as just, we are all equally justified in rejecting every book in the Bible from Genesis to Revelations, for in that letter I have demonstrated that *inside of certain limits* God is pleased with plural marriage on the part of *righteous men*; that it was a principle that was *designed for righteous men, and for righteous men only*, and not for wicked men. I have shown you that God was with Jacob all through his married life, with his four wives; that he revealed himself to him, *succored and helped* him in his distress, made promises to him, and blessed him as he has blessed few men in this life, and that Jacob spoke to Him face to face, which God himself says, *no wicked man* has ever done, or *ever will do and live*. So says Jacob: "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." (Gen. 32:27-30.) And He (God) said unto Moses: "Thou canst not see my face at this time, lest mine anger is kindled against thee also, and I destroy thee and thy people, for there shall no man among them see my face at this time and live, for they are *exceeding sinful*. And *no sinful man* (notice this), hath at *any time*, neither shall there be any sinful man at any time that shall see my face and live." (See Inspired Exodus 33:20.) So here is the strongest kind of evidence, that though Jacob was married to four different living wives, he was not living a life of sin as you Reorganized leaders have ever taught.

Paul says: "Marriage is honorable *in all* and the bed undefiled, but *whore mongers* and *adulterers* God will judge." (Heb. 13:4.) But we will see in a moment that Jacob's bed, though married to four living wives, was no exception to the heaven devised rule.

And it came to pass when Israel dwelt in that land that Reuben went and lay with Bilhah, his father's concubine, and Israel heard it. (Gen. 35:32.) Silence seemed to reign in regard to this heinous crime, until Jacob's last hours. Then he says to his sons: "Gather yourselves together that I may tell you what shall befall you in the last days." So putting his hands first on Reuben, his first-born's head, he says: "Reuben thou art my first-born, my might and the beginning of my strength, the excellency of dignity and the excellency of power, unstable as water, thou shalt not excell because thou wentest up to thy father's bed, then *defiledst* thou it. He went up to my couch." (Gen. 49:4.) But this is not all by a good deal. "Now the sons of Reuben, the first-born of Israel (for he was the first born); but for as much as *he defiled his father's bed*, his birthright was given to the sons of Joseph." So the birthright was taken from Reuben and given to the sons of Joseph because of Reuben's crime, the "*defiling* of his father's bed." Now what was the nature of this birthright which Reuben forfeited by this crime? It was simply the right to hold the great Patriarchial office of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob over all Israel and transmit that office to his first-born, from father to first-born clear down from that day to this. Because of this crime that office was given to the first-born sons of Joseph, the Patriarch, and that is how the father of Joseph the Seer came to have it conferred upon him, and after him it went to his first-born, Hyrum Smith, which office held the right to confer and seal blessings

upon all the righteous in the church of God and also to seal curses upon the wicked and to sit as a counsellor in the first presidency of the church. So that great honor and priesthood was forfeited to Reuben and his first-born sons in his posterity, and in addition to this forfeit-ure the great land of the west was given to Ephraim and Manassah, to whom God has made such great promises in time to come, or millenium, all because of Reuben's crime against his father's bed. Dear me, suppose all this was told of Mr. Strang! The Reorganized would no more believe it than in the story of Old Blue Beard. Now looking at all these things through the glasses of the Reorganized we make sad havoc of the straightforward testimonies of the Holy Scriptures, simply because that in this reorganized spirit we must look upon Job as a whoremaster all through his married life time, and therefore the idea of Jacob taking the right of the first-born from him, whose sin compared to that of his own was as a mere ant hill to a mountain, was an outrage of the very first order and injustice to the last degree. Then again the idea of a life-long whoremaster's bed being "*defiled*"—isn't that interesting—by either his son or anybody else, is so grossly ridiculous and inconsistent as to provoke only ridicule and contempt. And that *such* a man could have the effrontery or the audacity to call his sons together that *he* might tell them what would befall them in the latter days, or in any other days, deserves only the same ridicule and contempt. Thus you see that the spirit of the Reorganization followed up to its natural results forces the conclusion that the Scriptures are but the embodiment of folly, falsehood and nonsense, unworthy the credit of any reasonable or ~~sane~~ man. So then I contend that if Mr. Strang ought to be rejected as a false prophet, because he took a plurality of wives, for the same

reason and upon the same principle we should reject the claims of Jacob and Abraham and Moses and other prophets of God who did the same thing, or who upheld, aided or abetted them in taking them, or who taught in any way that such men were prophets of God. Get around it, under it, or over it if you can. Why not reject that whole class of men as prophets of God? For what is the difference between plural marriage to-day and plural marriage in the past? Not a whit. For murder is murder to-day as much so as in the past, robbery is robbery, adultery is adultery, whoredom is whoredom and perjury is perjury the world over, and through all time. So with all vices and virtues. Whatever their evil or good to-day, the same was true of them in the past and ever will be; and so God teaches in all lands and at all times.

On the other hand, if the taking of a plurality of wives upon the part of Jacob and Abraham and Abimilech and Moses and others was approved in the sight of God and was not at any time regarded as a sin on the part of these men, why should Mr. Strang be condemned as a great sinner and rejected as a false prophet *for the same act*? If the taking of several wives did not prevent their having the ministry of angels and receiving great and glorious blessings and revelations from them; if it did not prevent these men from holding the Urum and Thummum, and seeing God face to face and conversing and revealing his will to them to be handed down as wisdom to future generations, why would he not be as likely to reveal himself to Mr. Strang, whose righteousness and meekness were fully equal to them? For God said of Mr. Strang that he was "meeker than Moses and more patient than Job, and had kept himself unpolluted in the midst of the lustful and the ungodly until they had departed from him." Is there respect of persons with

God? Has he changed in his disposition so that the things he once approved, fostered, cherished, aided and blessed he now anathematizes and condemns? "I am the Lord, *I change not*, therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed." What does this imply? Simply that what God has done for a Jacob or any other man in any age or country he will do precisely the same for any other man in any other age or country, in *like circumstances* or for *like reasons*. These few words contain a whole volume in themselves without a word more. But I will pursue this matter a little further. How did Jacob come to be called Israel? In this way: An angel of God we are told wrestled with Jacob and the latter held him and refused to let him go till he blessed him. "What is thy name?" Said he, "Jacob." "Thy name," says the angel, "shall no more be called Jacob, but *Israel* shall be thy name," that is *Prince of God*, "for as a prince (of God) *hast thou power with God* and men and *hast prevailed*." What! An angel of God said this to a man who had lived all his married lifetime with four living wives and was then living with them and had been the father of all their children? O yes, that is just what he did say, but it is far from being all. For this same promise and blessing, on another occasion, was repeated to Jacob with additional great blessings, saying: "And God appeared to Jacob again when he came out of Padanaram and *blessed him*." And God said unto him: Thy name is Jacob; thy name shall not any more be called Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name, and he called his name Israel and God said unto him: I am God Almighty; *be fruitful and multiply*; a nation and a company of nations *shall be of thee* and *kings shall come out of thy loins* and the land which I gave Abraham and Isaac unto thee will I give it and to thy seed after thee will I give the land.

And God *went up* from him *in the place where he talked with him*. And Jacob set up a pillar of stone (that is a monument) in the place where he talked with him." (Gen. 35:9-15.) What was the monument for? To commemorate the glorious event of God's appearance unto him and the blessings, power and glory which he revealed unto him that it might remain a witness to the generations to come; that they might know that his God was God, and that there is none else. (See Book of the Law of the Lord Translated by the Prophet and Seer, James J. Strang, Chap. 9.)

While I am at it I may as well give the words referred to: "Whosoever the Lord thy God manifests himself unto thee in majesty and might, or walketh with thee and revealeth unto thee wisdom and knowledge, thou shalt erect unto him pillars, tablets and enduring monuments and make inscriptions upon them and shalt write and inscribe thereon his dealings with thee, his blessings and mercies and his great power and glory which he hath revealed unto thee; that it may remain a witness to the generations to come and that they know that thy God is God and that there is none else." (Book of the Law, page 111.)

How precious are the revelations of God through his anointed prophets!

Here is the Almighty bringing to light in these days by Mr. Strang the very laws, counsels and commandments written upon the hearts of his ancient patriarchs and prophets and by which they were moved to convey the glorious things which God revealed to them to future generations and from which the practice of setting up monuments in all nations originated; both to record great events and to keep in memory the names and works of the glorious dead. How precious are these things and how grandly those ancient practices witness to the revelations of God in these days,

and how grandly those revelations harmonize with those ancient testimonies and practices!

But the whole idea that God commanded a man with four wives to "return to his country and to his father's house and promised him that he would be with him; that the angels of God met with him, on the way wrestled with him, blessed him, changed his name, told him that as a prince of God he had power with God and men and had prevailed; that he saw and conversed with God *face to face*, and that when all his four wives had ceased to bear children he commanded *him* to be fruitful and multiply, and told him that kings should come out of *his* loins—the whole idea that God did all this, and a great deal more not here mentioned, to a man with four wives—do you think any Reorganized leader could believe in such things as these in these days? O, not he. He is too much inclined to prove to the world that he keeps no such company.

He does not worship any such God as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who has said: "This is my name for ever, and this is my memorial unto *all generations*." (Exod. 3:15.) He is too much inclined to honor the edicts and mandates of "Mystery Babylon" of the dark ages. He often in his preaching before the world declares that God changes not, yet there is no people who believe him more changeable than they. And he often flaunts the epitome of the faith of the Latter Day Saints also before the world, one paragraph of which reads: "We claim the privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of our conscience, and *allow all men the same privilege*, let them worship *HOW, WHERE or WHAT* they may." (Joseph the Seer.) Yet boasts of having done more to put down a certain principle of other men's faith—that of plural marriage—than all other people combined, though they have just

as good a right to their faith practically and mentally as any others in this land, or any other lands.

The Mormon people understand right well that the constitution of this land was not formed merely for Presbyterians, nor Methodists, nor Baptists, nor Congregationalists alone, nor for any other set of people who choose to call themselves orthodox, but for all possible shades of religious belief, so long as they do not injure any one else in his religious or secular rights.

And pray how have they done so much to put down this principle of the Mormon faith? Simply by falsely construing the faith of the Latter Day Saints, as Joseph Smith taught it. For he taught us that the dispensation which he was chosen of God to usher in, was to consist of or to be made up of all the dispensations of the past, to be revealed one by one until they were all revealed; besides much that has never yet been revealed among men. "For it is necessary," says Joseph Smith the Seer, "in the ushering in of the dispensation of the fulness of times, which dispensation is *now* (1842) beginning to usher in, that a whole and complete and perfect *union*, and *welding together* of dispensations, and keys, and powers, and glories should take place, and be revealed from the days of Adam, even to the present time; and not only this, but those things which have never been revealed from the foundation of the world, but have been kept hid from the wise and prudent, shall be revealed to babes and sucklings in this, the dispensation of the fullness of times." (See Lamoni Ed. Doc. and Cov., sec. 110, par. 18.)

Again Joseph the Seer says:
 "Now the thing to be known is, what the fulness of times means; * * * it means this: that the dispensation of the fulness of times is made up of all the dispensations that ever have been given

since the world began until this time." Unto Adam first was given a dispensation. And unto Noah was given a dispensation; then to Abraham, and from Abraham to Moses, then to the prophets that followed then to John, and to Jesus, and Peter, James and John. All the words of God spoken to all these are to come forth in their purity and completeness in this dispensation, or in this generation, according to the words of Peter also, who says: "And he shall send Jesus Christ, who before was preached unto you, whom the heavens must receive until the times of the restitution or *restoration of all things spoken by the mouths of all the holy prophets since the world began.*" (Acts 3:20.)

"And it shall come to pass that my people, who are of the house of Israel, shall be gathered home to the lands of their possessions, and *my word also shall be gathered in ONE.*" There is nothing which is secret, save it shall be revealed. There is no work of darkness, save it shall be made manifest in the light; and there is nothing which is *sealed* on the earth save it shall be loosed. Wherefore all things which have been revealed unto the children of men (in past ages) shall *at that day* (these Latter Days) *be revealed.*" (2d Book of Nephi, chap. 13:9-14.)

Here then are the testimonies of three unimpeachable witnesses, that *all* the dispensations of the past are to be revealed in this generation, and to be "united," "welded" and joined together in "one" grand whole, for the guidance, instruction and government of the church and kingdom of God.

And now my Reorganized friends what are you going to do about this matter? Going to still fight and oppose them as they come forth, and treat him whom God calls and anoints to bring them forth as a whoremaster and a false prophet? For in bringing to light the

Abrahamic and Mosaic dispensations we will have evidently plural marriage in them both, with both the approbation and command of God. You will be apt to learn then that the very men you have been reproaching for over forty years as whoremongers and adulterers were the best men of the earth, instead of being the worst, as you have for all those years been anxious to set forth.

But what in heaven's name does the Reorganization want with those dispensations? She has no use for any such dispensations. And if God should call and anoint a man to-morrow to translate and bring them to light, she would feel more like swearing that both translation and translator were frauds of the first order than anything else.

I must not let the case of Abimelech pass without a word on that. In Genesis, chap. 20, we have the account that Abimelech, king of Gerar, took Sarah, Abraham's wife, to be his in addition to one which he already had, besides several servant wives or wives "of the second rank," supposing her to be Abraham's sister, for Abraham had "supposed that the fear of God was not in the place," and that they would kill him in order to take his wife, so he told Sarah to say that she was his sister. So King Abimelech took her to be his wife, but God was Abraham's friend and warned Abimelech in a vision of the night that the woman was Abraham's wife, and that if he did not restore her that he and all his should be destroyed. "Lord," said he "said he not unto me, she is my sister." "In the *integrity* of mine heart, and the *innocency* of mine hands have I done this." And God answers him saying: "Yea, I know that thou didst this in the *integrity* of thine heart, for I also withheld thee from sinning against me. Now, therefore, restore the man his wife to him, for he is a *prophet* and shall *pray for thee*, and

thou shalt live, and if thou restore her not to him, know thou that thou shalt surely die, thou and all that are thine." How long these matters occupied we are not here informed, but at any rate we are told that those women or wives which Abimelech already had were rendered barren because of the taking of Sarah, Abraham's wife. But as God said, Abraham prayed unto God and God healed Abimelech and his wife and servant wives and they bore *unto him* children. (See Gen. 20th chapter and read both the Inspired Translation and the King James version.) At the 17th verse of the King James it is said that Abraham prayed unto God and God healed Abimelech and his wife, and maid servants and they *bore children*, but at the same passage in the Inspired version it reads that his wife and those servant wives bore "*unto him* children," that is, to Abimelech. And yet the Reorganized leader insists unyieldingly that Joseph the prophet and seer never wrote nor taught anything in behalf of plural marriage!

The very best thing they can do now is to vote down the Inspired Translation and just insist that Joseph the Seer never translated any Bible. Yes, by all means throw the inspired by as you have the lectures on faith in front of the Book of Doctrine and Covenants as you have Parley P. Pratt's contrast between the doctrine of men and the doctrine of Christ, out of the Voice of Warning as you have the book of Abraham and the Letter of Appointment and we may say pretty nearly the whole mosaic dispensation, and substitute for all these things your own human wisdom.

Some one more pious than wise may arise as some of the learned do, and tell us that God allowed the practice of plural marriage, because that heathen custom involved these men in it for the time being, but intended that it should in time be wholly abolished. I do not

know where this class of men have got their information from, for certainly such wisdom is not found anywhere in the Bible, but very much to the contrary. And the Book of Mormon shows very plainly that plural marriage was suppressed among the Nephites because of wickedness. "Thus saith the Lord: This people begin to wax in iniquity. They understand not the Scriptures, for they seek to justify themselves in *committing whoredoms*, because of the things which were written concerning David and Solomon. Behold David and Solomon truly had *many* wives and concubines, which were abominable before me," &c.

The vile traditions of the Reorganized church so far prevent their judgment, that they can see no difference between whoredom and the pure estate of plural marriage, which God delighted to honor and bless. Whoredom corrupts and depraves men and women to the last degree and sends them reeking with disease to premature graves without posterity, whereas plural marriage on the part of righteous men is the very opposite in all things. God has sworn that the whoremonger and adulterer shall be cast down to hell, shall deny the faith and shall have their portion in the lake of fire and brimstone, which is the second death. (Doc. & Cov. 63:5.) And all the scriptures so teach; whereas the men of plural marriage occupy the highest places in the kingdom of heaven and it is the highest privilege to be admitted into their society. As the Lord Jesus himself has said: "Many shall come from the east and the west and the north and the south and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God—glorious privilege—but the children of the wicked one; those who while they made great pretensions to purity and holiness, yet rejected, reproached and spoke evil of the dignities and prophets whom God

called and anointed to carry his word to the nations, who stigmatize their marriages, "the twin relic of barbarism and whoredom;" behold all those if they repent not of their wickedness, shall most assuredly be commanded to depart as workers of iniquity who never knew the Lord Jesus. Yes, I contend that it was because of wickedness that plural marriage was suppressed by command of God both through Lehi and Jacob on this land of America. "For behold I the Lord have seen the sorrow and heard the mourning of the daughters of my people in the land of Jerusalem, yea and in all the lands of my people, because of the *wickedness* and *abominations* of their husbands." But makes the reserve in the connection, that when a day of moral purity shall come he will command his people to enter again upon plural marriage, "otherwise they shall hearken unto these things;" that is, to the limitation to one wife, and that it was because of this wickedness that it was disallowed and forbidden. To interpret these things in any other way is to put the whole body of the scriptures at war with themselves; it is to make the Almighty a liar, and his holy word a bundle of the grossest inconsistencies, incongruities and irreconcilable and downright contradictions, for it stands out in many places in the scriptures that God withdraws himself from the transgressor and the wicked. In the case of King Saul we have this illustrated in a most remarkable degree, for in the midst of his distress, "God answered him not, neither by dream, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." (1st Sam. 28:1 to 6.) Yet David and Saul had a plurality of wives at this time, yet he answered David without any trouble, showing very clearly that neither were condemned for plural marriage. (2nd Sam. 2:1, 1st Sam. 23:9 to 12, 2nd Sam. 5:18, 19.)

In the Book of Mormon it is the same: "I will not succor my people in the day

of their transgression, but I will *hedge up their ways that they prosper not* and their doings shall be a *stumbling block unto them.*" (Book of Mosiah, Chap. 5:7), and again it is written that when God's people turn to wickedness and abominations and distress comes upon them, then we are told that they will call, but God will not answer them; that he will hide his face from them as they have behaved themselves ill in their doings. And of the false prophets who cause his people to err, "Night shall be unto them that they shall not have a vision, they shall all cover their lips for there is no answer from God." (Micah 3:4 to 7.)

"Now we know that God heareth not sinners, but if any man be a worshipper of God and doeth his will, him he heareth." (John 9:31.) "If I regard iniquity in my heart," says David, "the Lord will not hear me." (Is. 16:18.) Testing all these plurally married kings and patriarchs by these things we find that they were the men whom God *did* hear and reveal his will to on all occasions of real need and distress, and in regard to the past, the present and the future.

Looking at the history of those who the Reorganized leaders tell us were living in abomination before God in their having more than one wife, how did it happen that God and the angels of his presence were so near them throughout their married lives as we know they were? Were they all so blind that they really needed a Reorganized leader to show them the error of their ways? All this is only additional proof that their lives were pure and there is none who God has blessed more than they; or to whom he has made greater promises. And surely he has made no such promises to any of those who speak reproachfully of their marriages and think themselves very much their superiors in virtue, purity and holiness.

Who has seen greater things in regard to the birth, ministry, persecution, crucifixion and resurrection of the Saviour of mankind than David?

"Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led captivity captive and received gifts for men, yea for the rebellious also, that the Lord God might dwell among them." (Psal. 68:18.) "The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool." (Psal. 110:1.) "For dogs have compassed me about, the assembly of the wicked have enclosed me, they pierced my hands and my feet. * * * they part my garments among them and cast lots upon my vesture." (Psal. 21:16 to 18.)

"But unto the son he (God) saith, thy throne O God is forever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of the kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil gladness above thy fellows." (Heb. 1:8, 9, Psal. 45:6, 7.) These are but a few of the many things predicted by David some thousand years before Christ came into the world touching his ministry, his life and exaltation. Just so with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob; for Jesus says: "Abraham rejoiced to see my day and he saw it and was glad." (John 8:56.)

Who did the Almighty "succor" more? Who did he prosper and honor more? Who did he bless more? To who did he reveal more? Who were more successful in war and who was the Almighty nearer to than the plurally married men of the Bible? And why? Simply because of their faith and righteousness.

When you say that God merely suffered or "*allowed*" these things, looking to a time when such things would be abolished, &c., you not only assert that that has no foundation in the scriptures, but you give the lie to the Almighty himself; for he says, he "*cannot* look upon sin with *any degree of allow-*

ance." (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 1:5.) He could no more allow sin at that time than he can now, for the nature of sin is death to man. You might as well say he allowed theft and robbery, perjury, man stealing, adultery, Sabbath breaking or any other wrong which his law forbids. God "will not at all acquit the wicked." (Nahum 1:3.) He will "by no means clear the guilty." (Exod. 34:7.) "I will not justify the wicked." (Exod. 23:7.) "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness; for that which may be known of God is manifested unto them, for God hath showed it to them." (Rom. 1:18,19.) The Patriarchs were far from being ignorant of the law and commandments and precepts of God, for from what we now know of them it is beyond dispute that they knew more of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and his law and commandments, than this whole generation of clergy and priests and ministers put together with those of the Reorganization thrown in. For God says of Abraham that he obeyed his voice, kept his charge, *his commandments*, "his statutes, and his laws." (Gen. 26:5.)

But says one, "the many wives and concubines of David and Solomon were an abomination in the sight of the Lord;" according to the Book of Mormon, were they not? Certainly they were, always were and always will be. Any law that God ever gave is liable to be abused and carried to a gross and a dangerous excess or extreme, and knowing this God gave a commandment forbidding the kings of Israel to *multiply* wives to themselves, lest their hearts turn from them to strange women. The Reorganized say that to take one to another is multiplying wives. No, for that would be multiplying the singular, whereas it is the plural that is forbidden to be multiplied. And how could the

plural be multiplied unless the plural was there to begin with? How could one multiply his words unless he added to words already used or uttered? How could Israel say our transgressions are multiplied unless they added transgressions to those already had? And so we might here multiply those questions and examples, but it would be useless. Anyone can see that to multiply the plural is to add to the plural. Besides those kings were forbidden also to multiply horses. To multiply horses is of course to add to horses already possessed. Nor would it be reasonable that the kings of Israel should have but one horse nor anybody else. David undoubtedly multiplied or added wives to a degree displeasing to God, as indeed other kings of Israel did, but that was not at the time when he had three wives, nor six, nor eight, nor ten, nor was it when he (God) gave the several wives of Saul into his bosom, besides those he had already, when he made him the promise that he would build up his throne to all generations, nor when he swore by an oath, that of the fruit of his loins he would raise up Christ to sit upon his (David's) throne. (Acts 2:29 to 35.) Nor was it at the time when the good thought of building a temple unto the Lord came into his heart, which was when more than half of his life was past; for then God made him promises such as but very few men have ever obtained and both the prophet Nathan and God himself testified to the righteousness of David, and witnessed that God was still with him, as we read in 2nd Sam., chap. 7:3, and in chap. 8:14, we read that God preserved David wherever he went, and that he, David, executed judgment and justice to all the people of Israel. During the whole period of his kingly ministry up to this time he had the entire and unqualified approbation and favor of God, as the history of those times will abundantly

show. No cloud of God's disfavor or displeasure overshadowed this period of his life, although he had at least ten wives. Several of these God himself says he took from Saul, and gave them into David's bosom (2d Sam. 12:4-8); and again God by the mouth of Nathan says: "I was with thee whither soever thou wentest, and have cut off *all* thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name, like unto the name of the great men which are in the earth." (Chap. 7:1 to 9.)

To deny that God was with David and that he had the full favor of God during this period of his ministry is to deny one of the strongest and best proved facts of the Bible. Saul had a plurality of wives as well as David. Perhaps some one may say God turned against Saul because of that. But that cannot be true, for at the time that God cast him down and gave the kingdom of Israel to David, the latter had several wives as well as Saul. It is clear then, that it was for disobedience in several other directions, and not for plural marriage, that Saul was cast down. That was never named against him as a crime.

There are evidently two periods in the reign of David,—the first and the longest was a very bright and prosperous one in which God and men were well pleased; and the latter one of dark clouds, reverses, and curses and sad calamities! These reverses, curses and calamities began to date from his most unfortunate affair to Uriah.

God said to Jereboam, by the prophet Ahijah the Shilonite, which Jereboam was the first chosen king over the ten tribes of Israel after the death of Solomon: "And it shall be, if thou shalt hearken unto all that I command thee, and wilt walk in my ways and do right in my sight, to keep my statutes and my commandments, as did David my servant in *the day when I blessed*

him; I will be with thee, and build thee a *sure house* as I built for David, and give Israel unto thee." (1st Kings 11:38 Inspd.)

"In the day that I blessed him." When was that? Surely it was the forepart of his reign up to the thought of building the temple. And surely no man could be more blessed in this life than was David, in this period of time. God fought all his battles, delivered him out of all his distresses, and from the hand of his greatest enemy, Saul, when the latter sought him with his armies in all his dominions, while he (David) had but a few men with him, gave him counsel by Urim and by prophets in the very moment when it was needed, and it was not refused him as it was Saul at any time in this period of his reign and the blessings put upon him reaches into the eternal worlds never to end. Were not all this a curiously strange way to prove to all mankind that he does "not succor his people in the day of their transgressions," that "he cannot look upon sin with the least degree of allowances," that "he hides his face from sinners," if it so be that David was such a great sinner as the Reorganized Leaders try to make him out, during his whole married life?

David, like Jacob of old, walked and talked with God face to face, and "his life was preserved." "O God," says David, "thou art my God; early will I seek thee; my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and thirsty land where no water is, to see thy power and glory so as *I have seen thee in the sanctuary.*" (Ps. 63:1, Doc. & Cov. 94:4.)

Either in the tabernacle or temple of God, if any wicked or corrupt man entered there, there was no hope that he could see the face of God and converse with him and live; for it was for this very purpose, or one of the purposes

for which such temples and tabernacles are built, that is that the meek and pure in heart might see God therein and obtain knowledge and wisdom and blessing from him. (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 94:4.)

Now as God has spoken of a time when he blessed David and then we know that he had a plurality of wives all along. (1st Kings 11:38.) So he also speaks of a time when he cursed him. (1st Kings, 15:45), and we know that that cursing dates from and after his crime against Uriah. Then again God would be satisfied, according to his own word, if all the Israelitish kings would only do as David did in his "first ways." And the Lord was with Jehoshaphat, because he walked in the "*first ways*" of David and sought not unto Balaam." (2d Chron. 17:3, 4.) That of course refers to David's life as a ruling king, and not when a boy shepherd.

Great stress is laid upon the fact that Sarah ordered the bondmaid, Hagar, to be cast out and that God sanctioned the act.

This is one of those instances where drowning men catch at straws. Do not the enemies of plural marriage see that Hagan was cast out of the household because of her incorrigible and untractable disposition? Any reader of Bible history who cannot see this fact, it is self-evident he does not want to see it. Why should she be put away any more than the three extra wives of Jacob? Why could not the sons of Hagar have remained in Abraham's household and be counted as legitimate sons of his, as well as the sons of Jacob's four wives?

But the truth is she was not put away as a wife at all. She was simply cast out of the household, or the family, with the choice of two positions to take—either to remain single or be reconciled to her husband." (1st Cor. 7:11.)

For as Jesus says that from the beginning down to Moses it was not lawful

for a man to put away his wife, excepting for fornication or adultery, so neither could Abraham or anybody else do so lawfully only for that cause.

But some one perhaps may arise and say: "O, neither Hagar nor any of that class of women were wives, nor regarded as such." Oh, worse and worse! Then if they weren't wives Abraham was a fornicator and Jacob was a worse one and it comes with a very ill grace to call these men fathers of the faithful. But having referred to these cases before I will merely prove that they were wives though only of the "*second rank*," that is, "*servant wives*."

"And Sarah, Abram's wife, took Hager her maid, the Egyptian, after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan and gave her to her husband Abram to be *HIS WIFE*." (Gen. 16:3.) "And she (Rachel) gave him (Jacob) Bilhah her handmaid *TO WIFE*." (Gen. 30:4.) "And when Leah saw that she had left bearing she took Zilpa her maid and gave her to Jacob *to wife*." (Gen. 30:9.) And Jacob said: Give me *my wives* and *my children*, for whom I have served thee (Laban) for thou knowest my service which I have done thee. (Gen. 30:26.)

"Then Jacob rose up and set *his sons* and *his wives* upon camels," &c. (Gen. 31:17) O now did not these Patriarchs stand greatly in need of some Reorganized leader, to instruct and lead them out of error's ways? O, they were sadly benighted! Even the Almighty and the angels of his presence were "away off," out of the field of enlightenment, for it seems that the greatest blessings these patriarchs ever received were *after* they were married to a plurality of wives. And even to this day he has forgotten to confer any *such* blessings on that very *faithful, pure* and Reorganized people, and just listen to this: "God hath given me my hire, because I gave *my maiden* to *my hus-*

band. And she called his name Isach-
er, that is hire." (Gen. 30:18.)

Another says: "O, all this was Old Testament doings, but Jesus changed all this and limited all men to the one wife system." Did he? If he did some one I hope will be kind enough to point out where and when, and in what way. He did say this: "Moses for the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning" (down to Moses) "it was not so." (Math. 19:8.) And again he said—sermon on the Mount—"But I say unto you that WHOSOEVER shall put away his wife, excepting for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery, and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." (Math. 5:31, 32.) The word "WHOSOEVER" is a very broad and sweeping term. It simply covers the whole earth, and excepts not one man. And now, as it is a well known fact that plural marriage at that time (that is in the time of Christ) was in practice in nearly all nations, and had been from the days of Adam, was not that word: "Whosoever" shall put away his wife saving for adultery causes her to commit adultery; and whosoever marieth her that is divorced committeth adultery? A mighty curious way to teach that no man shall have but one wife. (Math. 5:32.) We are told in history both by Josephus and Adam Clark and others that Herod had ten wives when John the Baptist reproved him because of taking his *living* brother's wife, and he was very far from reproving him for taking any of the other nine; but had the brother been dead, he would have been perfectly free and justified in taking her, according to the Law of God. Indeed he would have been obligated to take her, according to that law. (Deut. 25:5 to 10) also Book of Ruth, 1st to the 4th chap. This was also the law of God among the Patriarchs, long before Moses' time, and no

doubt was in force before the flood, and because Onan refused to raise up seed to his dead brother, God destroyed him. (Gen. chap. 38, Deut. 25:5-10.) No doubt among men of several wives, as well as the singly married, there were some cases where the husbands were tempted to put away one that they might take another. The language of Jesus forbids this, and declares that he that does so, causes (or impels) her to commit adultery. And not only that, but in case that he took another wife, in such a wife's stead, he would be counted as guilty of adultery himself, by the law of God, as Jesus expounds it. (Math. 19:8, 9; Mark 10:11.) These things had just as much reference to the plurally married man as the singly married. No difference.

Covenants, and especially marriage covenants, were considered just as sacred when made by a married man to any female, as though they were both single. And to corrupt, or lie with any female under a betrothal, or marriage covenant to another man, married or single, though they had not yet come together as man or wife, was punished with death, for such a female was regarded as a man's wife. (Deut. 22:23, 24.)

There is no evidence that Jesus made any change in the marriage law as it came down from the fathers, except to make the marriage covenant more binding. For whereas Moses allowed divorce for several reasons, Jesus allowed it only for one—fornication or adultery. Indeed this very passage, found in the gospel as given by the apostles, is proof beyond question that Jesus altered no part of the marriage law only to make its covenants the more sacred and binding, as it was among the Patriarchs long before Moses!

Now, as Jesus said he did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfill it; that is, to keep it, for to fulfill law is to do it, to

truly interpret it, to faithfully administer it, and expound it, for it is written, "he shall magnify the Law, and make it honorable," (Is. 42:21, 24, 25,) this is a good place to examine some of the principles of that law, which all the leading Christians everywhere tell us he (Jesus) obeyed to the letter.

The renowned Watts says:

"He honored all his father's laws

Which we have disobeyed.

He bore our sins upon the cross

And our full ransom paid."

And the good preachers of our times never tire telling us of the grand achievement of his having obtained eternal redemption and salvation for us through his strict obedience to *that law*!! Which is all true enough; true to a perfect certainty. Well now let us suppose a case:

Here comes a woman before the Saviour and she says: "My Lord, my husband died some six months ago, and the Law of our God says that such a man's wife shall not marry without unto a stranger; that her husband's brother shall go into her, marry her and raise up seed to his dead brother. Is it right that he should do as this Law requires?" Now ye Revs., and ye Reorganized Revs., supposing that you were standing by, what answer would he be bound to give that woman in this case? I should expect, were I present in this case, to hear Jesus say:

By all means do as the Law of God teaches, and if he will not build up his brother's house, do as the law of the Lord requires, and let this right go to next nearest kinsman. (Ruth 3:12-14.)

"What of all this?" says one. Nothing, only it sanctions plural marriage. For if it be necessary to take the wife of the dead, in order to build up *his* house, it is just as necessary that the living brother who takes her, have a wife of his own, in order to build up his own

house, that "*his* name be not lost in Israel." (Deut. 25:5-10; Book of Ruth chaps. 1 to 4.) Now, my Reorganized friend, you may kick at this thing, but you will find some pretty sharp spikes there to kick against.

Well, we will suppose that another woman comes up to the Saviour saying, "Oh, my Lord, I am one of two wives, and my son was the first born in the household, and my husband refuses to acknowledge him the first born, but intends to give that right to a younger son born of his other wife. Is this right according to the Law of the Lord?"

I should expect to hear Jesus say in this case: "Verily I say unto you that thine husband wrongeth thy son and thee, for he is the head of his father's house, and the double portion of the inheritance belongeth of right unto him." (Deut. 21:15-17; Gen. 49:3, 4.)

Let us suppose still another case. A certain man said to Jesus: "Oh, my Lord, I am a man with a family of sons and daughters, and a certain man (married or single as the case might have been) has seduced and lain with one of my daughters, and he refuses to marry her. What sayest thou to this?" "The Law of God," I would expect Jesus to say, "demands that such a man shall *surely* endow her to be his wife." And as all laws have penalties attached, and "any law without a penalty is about the same as no law at all," I should expect Jesus to say that if he did not marry her he should be punished by the law. "Ah," says the Reorganized man, "Jesus never said anything like *that*." Did he not? I remember him saying, "God commanded, saying, 'Honor thy father and thy mother, and he who curseth father or mother, let him die the death,'" but ye scribes and Pharisees teach contrary to it. "Thus have ye made the Law of God of none effect by your traditions. Ye hypocrites," etc. (Exod. 22:16; Deut. 22:28, 29; Math. 15:1-9.)

Now in the law translated by Mr. Strang, by Urin and Thummum, it is written: "And if thou covenant or promise to marry a woman or a virgin, thou shalt not break thy covenant; thou shalt not draw back from thy promise, and if she conceive seed of thee, thou shalt take her to wife; thou shalt not bring her shame upon her; if thou dost her brethren shall stone thee; and none shall deliver thee." (Book of the Law, page 316.)

In modern times, if it were a horse trade or a hog trade, wherein a few paltry dollars were at stake, a man would be considered a mighty mean man if he did not stand to his agreement, but the most solemn and sacred covenants made to innocent females may be sundered as ropes of sand! They and their children may be torn away from their husbands and fathers as if they were so many of the lower animals, and the fathers imprisoned, and robbed by law, and it seems that nothing pleases the Reorganized better than to witness that. If only the husband has a weak barren or consumptive wife to begin with, to take a second wife to keep his name from being blotted out, oh, that is an awful crime and a sufficient cause for robbery and imprisonment. Chicago has somewhere about fifty thousand public and private prostitutes and all other Christian cities a like proportion, all created, fostered and built up by law, and so barbarous and cruel are the sentiments of most modern Christians, and especially Reorganized Mormons, it would seem that they would much rather prefer to see countless thousands go down yearly to premature graves, reeking with corruption and loathsome disease, than that one man, even though he were a benefactor to his race, should take a second wife to keep his name from being blotted out, if even they knew that the taking of such a wife would prevent her from entering upon such an infamous and loathsome life!

Such a doctrine was never taught by either the Lord Jesus Christ, or any one of his apostles or prophets, for most assuredly he kept the whole Law of the Lord, as it was given to both the patriarchs and to Moses; kept it as a member of God's church and kingdom, and an authorized expounder of the whole law of God. And he dare not do otherwise than expound it in its clearest light. Alas for the salvation of man, if he had broken it in even one of its *least points* or principles, for he has been put in possession of the keys of the resurrection, and the life everlasting for all the faithful among men, because of his entire and complete obedience to all God's laws and commandments. No other could ever obtain such keys and power, and no other could ever have been made "the captain of our salvation."

He dare not interpret the Law of God or expound it in a false light, to favor even himself in the least point, because if he did he would be sinning against God and doing injustice to man. That being the living truth, I defy all the logic in the universe to truthfully deny that Jesus taught plural marriage, because the law which he so faithfully kept does teach it, and **HE MUST KEEP IT!!!**

Now it seems that history is in harmony with these scriptural facts, otherwise why should the most learned among foreign missionaries put the following on record?

"The Calcutta Missionary Conference (representing Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists and Congregationalists) consisting of the various societies which have missionaries in that vicinity, after frequent consultations and much consideration on the subject of polygamy as it exists in India, were unanimous in the following conclusion: If a convert before he becomes a christian has married more wives than one, *in ac-*

cordance with the practice of the Jewish and PRIMITIVE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES, he will be permitted TO KEEP THEM ALL; but such a person is not eligible to any office in the church. [INDIA Ancient and Modern, etc., p. 601.]”

It is curious how easily modern sectarians adapt themselves to circumstances, when there is a chance to enlarge their numbers by it. It fairly leaves the impression that, if the Mormons should depart from their own faith, and be willing to join the sectarian churches upon the condition that they be allowed to retain their wives, they would soon find out an approved way to admit them! They would soon proclaim that it was “in harmony with the practice of the Jewish and *Primitive Christian churches*,” while now scarcely anything short of annihilation of the whole Mormon people will satisfy them, because they simply practice that doctrine which they themselves say was the practice of “the Jewish and Primitive Christian churches!”

The prophet Isaiah says that in the latter days, when the “Branch of the Lord shall be beautiful and glorious, and the fruits of the earth are excellent and comely for them that are escaped of Israel,” and the sins of Zion and Jerusalem are washed away, that at that day seven women shall “take hold of one man saying, we will eat our own bread and wear our own apparel, only let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach.” (Is. 1:1 to 4.)

We would inform these good women before hand that the Reorganization simply believes that such an act on their part would be the very way to bring reproach instead of taking it away. But as these women will be Jewish, and will understand the scriptures any amount better than the Reorganized, they will not thank them for their anti-scriptural opinions.

At the time of the house of Israel being given into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, Zedekiah was the reigning king, and Jeremiah was the prophet of God to the people. The Almighty counseled Israel for their safety to give themselves up, and go into Babylon, but Zedekiah was stiff necked and refused to give himself up and go to Babylon, as Jeremiah commanded him by the word of God. “Obey, I beseech thee,” said he, “the word of the Lord which I speak unto thee. But if thou refuse to go forth, this is the word of the Lord which he hath showed me. And behold all the women that are left in the king of Judaea’s house shall be brought forth to the king of Babylon’s princes, and those women shall say (to the king), Thy friends have set thee on; thy feet are now sunk in the mire and they are gone away back. Thus shall they bring out all *thy wives* and thy children to the Chaldeans and thou shalt not escape out of their hand, * * * and thou shalt cause this city to be burnt with fire.” (Jer. 38:20 to 23.) Here is the word of the Lord that this king’s wives and children should be preserved to him if he obeyed; if not they were simply to taunt him with trusting in fools and wicked men, who, when they saw him fast in the mire, they would leave him. If plural marriage then is a sin and nothing but sin, we have here the Almighty promising to protect a man in his sin if he would only obey him, upon the same principle that the popes sell indulgences for a consideration. This is one of the numerous blundering conclusions which Reorganized teachings lead to.

Well, there is another thing in relation to this Babylonish captivity that I will mention here. Many thousands of captives were taken to Babylon at this time of men, women and children of all ages. The word of the Lord to these captives by Jeremiah was: “Thus saith

the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, unto ALL that are carried away captive whom I have caused to be carried away captive from Jerusalem into Babylon. Build ye houses and dwell in them and plant gardens and eat the fruit of them; *take ye wives and beget sons and daughters* and take wives to your sons and give your daughters to husbands, that they may bear sons and daughters, that ye may be increased there and not diminished." (Jer. 19:1 to 6.) Now Reorganized proclivities require us to believe that among this vast throng, consisting of "elders" and "priests" and "prophets" and people, that there was not a married man in the whole body! Among those elders and priests and prophets there must of necessity have been many men varying from twenty to fifty years old and consequently pretty nearly if not all married men and it would not be strange at all if some of them were not possessed of *two or three* wives. However the commandment was to "*all*," married or single. And it must be remembered they were going into a land of plural marriage, that is, Babylon, and had just left their own land which was of course a land of plural marriage also. (Dan. 5:2, 3, 23. Esther 2:17.) So these captives could not misunderstand the commandment; for at this time not only were Israel and Chaldaea nations of plural marriage, but every known nation on earth had plural marriage in practice.

In the coming out of Egypt the Midianites through the counsel of Balaam tried to destroy Israel with various seductive vices, so that a plague was brought in upon Israel and resulted in the death of some twenty-four thousand souls. So God commanded Israel to go out against these Midianites and cut them off and they came back with immense spoil of many kinds, among which were *thirty-two thousand young women* "who had not known man by

lying with him." All the others were exterminated by the direct law and commandment of God—men and women.

The reader should read carefully the 31st chapter of Numbers, and he will see that God and not Moses directed this whole thing, as he did all Israel's other wars. And in regard to these young women Moses said, "these ye shall keep alive for yourselves," (verse 18.) Why did the Almighty command these to be saved alive? Were there not more than enough young women in Israel already to furnish all the males with one wife? To say that this is not another evidence that God commanded and encouraged plural marriage in Israel, is only doing violence to the scriptures, and to reason. Besides God made it a law to Israel that when they went to war with nations who sought their destruction to destroy all, when they fell into their hands, but those females who had not known man by lying with them. (Deut. 20:10 to 16.)

Many thousands fell in war in Israel at various times, leaving many wives and daughters without husbands, by the one wife system. Yet the Law of God says there shall be no harlot of the house of Israel (Deut. 23:17), and the promise is made that when Israel abides faithful to the Law of God, that there shall be *none* barren among them," neither *male* nor *female*. (Deut. 7:14.) So you see there was no chance in Israel for either widows or daughters or females taken captive in war, to be barren or to live unnatural lives, no matter how many men fell in war, or how many the females might out-number the males. The wives of the dead went to their nearest kinsmen, and if there were to be none barren among them, then as a matter of course, many men in Israel must have several wives.

How barbarously different it is in Christian countries, so-called. In times of war there is no thought taken for

either the wives of the slain or the daughters left without husbands.

In some of the states of South America by reason of desolating wars the females outnumber the males six to one. And it is not so long ago, when in Mexico they outnumbered them three to one. Indeed all nations and peoples from the days of Adam seem to have a preponderance of women over men, for notwithstanding that at least three-fourths of the population of the earth have today plural marriage among them, and always have had, and in past centuries all nations had it in practice from the earliest ages; yet who ever heard of the complaint that any considerable class among them have had to live single because so many among them have had more than one wife? Nobody. Even the Christian missionaries, who can see no good among those they call heathen, unless it be according to their own corrupt traditions, have never brought home a complaint of any thing of that kind. And even in the palmiest days of David and Solomon, when the latter abused, and carried plural marriages to the grossest extreme, no historian has handed us down any such complaint. In addition to this fact, desolating wars, and especially the desolating wars of these last days, leave millions of women husbandless, and childless to go down to their graves without fulfilling the end for which they were created. Such things in Israel caused the prophets of God to weep, saying "the young men fell in battle, and their maidens were not given in marriage"; (Ps. 78:63; Deut. 28:32.) It is said in the New Testament that the spirit of Jesus Christ was in the holy prophets, who prophesied of his coming, suffering, resurrection and glorification. (1st Peter 1:9 to 12.)

These prophets all upheld the law of God given to the patriarchs and to Moses, and they, like their master, dare

not do otherwise. And that law upheld and taught plural marriage, but there is not much of that spirit in the Reorganized leaders; for instead of upholding the righteousness of that law, they uphold in unparalleled and fanatical zeal the mad dogism of the edicts and mandates of old Rome in the dark ages which have consigned untold millions of the fairest of God's creatures to the regions of the damned childless, reeking and festering in sexual diseases, to premature graves.

All these diabolical and damning consequences as certainly follow these edicts and mandates, as darkness follows day, or as the blighting of frosts follow the receding of the sun. For houses of ill fame are not found anywhere only in so-called Christian monogamic countries. As Mr. Strang says: "The fact that houses of prostitution are unknown in polygamic countries, while they exist everywhere in monogamic countries, and *cannot be suppressed*, ought to put to shame those who object to plural marriage on the score of chastity. And the further fact that where polygamy prevails, adultery is exceedingly rare, and in monogamic countries so common as to scarcely call for a passing remark, should cause such objectors to seal their lips."

Plural marriage not only abolishes houses of prostitution most effectually, but it also "makes so many opportunities of a happy settlement in life, that an amiable and virtuous young woman cannot fail of finding an affectionate and worthy husband."

Over in Utah they have been boasting for many years that a house of prostitution did not exist in the territory; but since laws have been made abolishing their *scriptural* marriages, that territory has as many houses of prostitution as any other Christian city, or country, according to population. This state of things, though diabolical and murder-

ous in high degree in itself, seems to please the Reorganization *right well*. They haven't a word of blame or condemnation for anything of this kind.

In the "Law of the Lord," translated by Mr. Strang from the plates of Laban, it is written: "Thou shalt not go after strange women; for so should the land be corrupt under thy feet, an abhorring to the righteousness; and in the mixing of thy seed is barrenness and desolation, the corruption of the flesh and disease and anguish."

Now we know that these things are true, for wherever prostitution exists, there barrenness, disease, short life and desolation follows. "Among the converted or Christian Kanackers the evil is past remedy. The vices introduced and sown broadcast among them by Christian residents and sailors, have taken such deadly effect, that the women are generally barren. The population is diminishing several thousand annually. The Sandwich Islanders, which, when first visited by Christian missionaries contained a half million of these people, have not now sixty thousand." So said Mr. Strang in 1856. They are but a handful now. Christian polygamy is surely exterminating them. The same cry comes from Alaska. It is pitiful indeed to hear the pleadings of those aboriginal mothers before the authorities there to protect their daughters from the diabolical and beastly lusts of those dwelling among them. And it is doubtful whether in the wasting of the Indian tribes of America before the white Christian races, the "*venereal disease*" did not have more to do with their disappearance than either the sword or the "fire water" of the white man. For the Indian medicine man knows nothing about the "*venereal disease*" which, not to hide its real character by Greek or Latin terms, simply means, not the small pox, but the *large* pox, which always follows the practice

of Christian polygamy. For there is evidently *two* kinds of polygamy—the one is the Christian and the other the Hebrew, or Israelitish kind. The two are as teetotally opposite in their results as any two things can possibly be. The one carries the seal of death, desolation and destruction upon it from beginning to end. It has neither mothers nor fathers, nor sons nor daughters. The English language is scarcely capable of expressing its horrors.

The other, to commence with, God is its author, and therefore cannot be in error. It gives health, and strength, and beauty of form, and soundness of constitution to fathers, mothers, sons and daughters. Other things being right, the parents live to a good old age, honored and respected as they ought, and deserve to be, by their children, for many generations. For where several women are willing to share the affections of one man, possessed of every excellence, their dispositions must necessarily be socially and morally good, and they would therefore be very likely to hand down these excellent traits to their posterity.

With all these very pointed and distinct differences between the plural marriage of the Bible and Christian polygamy, or prostitution, yet the sectarian preacher, with here and there an exception can see no difference, and the Reorganized preacher is the blindest of the two.

But what about the world to come? Will marriage and the increase of the race still go on? O yes, so the word of God says, at any rate.

"And at day when I shall come in my glory, shall the parable be fulfilled which I spoke concerning the ten virgins; for they that are WISE and have received the TRUTH and have taken the Holy Spirit for their guide and have *not been* DECEIVED," (by false teachers and false leaders), "verily I say unto

you, they shall not be hewn down and cast into the fire, but shall abide the day and the earth," (in the Edenic and purified state) "shall be given unto them for an inheritance and *they shall MULTIPLY* and wax strong, and their children shall grow up without sin unto salvation and the Lord shall be in their midst and his glory shall be upon them and he will be their king and their law-giver." (Doc. & Cov. Sec. 45:10, Lamoni Ed.)

Now, these things call forth many reflections. How, for instance, can the increase of the race in the world to come be reconciled with the saying: "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are they given in marriage?" (Math. 22:23-30.) If the revelations of Joseph Smith's successor are as reliable as those of his predecessor, and we most assuredly believe they are, then the wives of the deceased husbands go to their *first* husbands to whom they have been joined in *this* life for time and eternity—no matter how many times they might marry afterward, (that is after their first husband's death). Such women can only be joined to one man—their first husbands, for this and the life to come. Therefore in the resurrection *they* merely return to their first husbands without either marrying or being "given in marriage." Please give us a sounder exposition of these things if you can. (Book of the Law of the Lord, page 317:12.)

The Reorganized view of these things is a sort of *divine free lovism*, which we may say and see by the law of God, is a very refined sort of whoredom and prostitution. For whatever constitutes whoredom and prostitution in this life, would constitute them in the life to come; for neither time nor circumstances can ever sanctify these sins. If the race is to be multiplied in the life to come it must and will be done by marriage; for all cohabitation of the sexes outside of

the bonds of matrimony is criminal. And right here another question arises: Supposing a man in the church of God buries his first and second wife and he marries the third and they have each been faithful women, and at the coming of Jesus Christ they are all four—husband and his three wives resurrected together, and that the race is to be multiplied in the resurrected life by marriage, who do these two or three wives belong to? As they have never in their lives committed any offence to justify putting away that husband, according to the words of the Saviour, can no more put them away then than he could now.

To put them away, then, would be causing them to commit adultery as much so as it would now. What is the difference? The refined priests and bishops of our time pronounce all this "*coarse*" and "*vulgar*" and "*materialistic*" and "*sensual*" and even "*brutish*." But there is not a soul of them that knows any more about the world to come than the heathen themselves. Indeed, where would any man or woman prefer to be, either here or hereafter, more than in the society of those they loved, he or she? God gives every man a portion of the earth's surface, who serves him, as he gave it to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and their children after them, for an "*everlasting possession*," and when it is purified and cleansed from all evil and all sin and wickedness and it brings forth in its Edenic strength and beauty, all things that will please the eye and gladden the human heart, where all sorrow and grief and mourning and sighing will be at an end, and all the brute creation be at eternal peace and harmony one with the other and be lead by a little child. What is there coarse, and gross, and vulgar and brutish about all this? This is the great inheritance that Jesus has won for us by his faith and his toil and trials and obedience un-

der all kinds of suffering and persecution.

Why Jesus, after his resurrection, ate a piece of "broiled fish and a honey-comb" to shew that the resurrection was a real fact, a real victory over death. And at the last supper he has said that he would "no more drink of the fruit of the vine, till he drank it new with you in my Father's kingdom, and then again he has told us something about people sitting down and *eating* and *drinking at his table* in his kingdom." (Luke 24:41-43; John 21:1-12; Luke 22:29, 30.) Indeed, he even built a fire on the beach and cooked fish and called his fishermen disciples to come and eat with him after his resurrection.

But perhaps all of this is too coarse and materialistic for the good Bishop Fallows, who so elegantly and eloquently abused the Mormons in the New York Herald lately.

If the Mormons would only talk about their heaven being located somewhere "beyond the bounds of *time* and *space*" where "a million souls might all dance on the point of a cambric needle, and all have plenty of room," or expect to occupy their time gliding from planet to planet on sunbeams, or riding upon a cloud playing a harp, or some other such learned moonshine, no doubt it would all be tolerated or approved by the very learned and refined bishops and all that class of men. But our motto is, "Let God be true, though it makes all men liars."

Mr. Strang, for the first three or four years of his ministry, was dead set against plural marriage, and that fact should force the belief that he would never have entered upon the practice of plural marriage without very good reasons for so doing. His labors, in consequence of the disorder which had arisen in the church, because of usurpation and false leaders and false teachings, were simply prodigious, and because of

his faithfulness God said to him: "My servant James, in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thee, because I have tried thee and found thee faithful." (Given Sept 1, 1845.)

Now the Josephite, in his little narrow Reorganized views, can see nothing in all this, only a deeply laid scheme to gratify low and sensual desires. So let him think. He can see a very similar promise made to Abraham, and that God fulfilled it in his own way, but he will do nothing of that kind NOW to any one, no matter how well he may serve him. And he can see that God made a very similar promise to Jacob, and fulfilled it in his own good way, but he wont do anything like that NOW. He has no trouble in believing that Jacob's blessing prevailed above those of his progenitors, though he had *four* wives, but has no faith that God will give any such blessings to any such man NOW. He can see that God made the glorious promise by oath to David that of the fruit of his (David's) loins he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, though this David had at least *ten* wives at this time, but he wont do anything of that kind to any such man NOW. God is a different being NOW. He is ashamed of his former company NOW. He has learned by experience NOW that the founders of the Reorganization know a great deal better and are much wiser NOW than he was in those days.

Now what I have written in this article I have written in defense of Mr. Strang and the scriptural principles which he taught in his ministry. And as the Reorganized Mormons have long and persistently and shamefully abused, and slandered Mr. Strang and the principles which he taught, I have here particularly addressed myself to them. I am now in my seventy-sixth year and have meditated much in the Law, and in the gospel of Jesus Christ. and in

the claims of J. J. Strang, and Joseph Smith and the other prophets of both Bible and Book of Mormon in the last fifty years; and I am satisfied that the claims of both Joseph Smith and James J. Strang, and the revelations and translations which they have given to the people of this generation, will stand any amount of investigation.

Moreover as the Mormons under Mr. Strang, after his death were scattered here and there for a long time without anyone to admonish or warn them against deception and fraud, there have many of them fallen a prey to the abominable influences around them, such as spiritualism, infidelity, atheism, Bancemyism, Gurleyism, Briggsism and Brighamism, and being ordained to watch over a few branches of the church, I have been under the necessity of writing these controversies to vindicate Mr. Strang's claims and ministry, and to put a stop to their being further duped and swallowed up by these foul delusions. I claim that we hold the right to defend the principles of our faith in this land as well as any other people upon it, orthodox or unorthodox.

The Reorganized Mormons are exceedingly anxious to prove to everyone that Joseph the Prophet was just as great an enemy and just as ignorant to the great truths of the Bible as they are themselves; but if there was but one-tenth of the evidence against Mr. Strang that there is against Joseph Smith as the introducer of plural marriage there would be no trouble at all in convincing them that Strang was sole author and revealer of that, or any other principle of doctrine.

I cannot believe that Joseph Smith went over the whole Bible, Urim and Thummim in hand, without being fully convinced of the truth of plural marriage, and God's full approbation of it

on the part of righteous men. And it is not at all unreasonable to believe him the very person who first introduced it. "The mysteries of the kingdom of God are not given to every man," says Hyrum Smith, "and they to whom they are given are placed under restrictions to impart only such as God will command them, and the residue is to be kept in a faithful breast, otherwise he will be brought under condemnation. (Times and Seasons, vol. 5, page 474, and Book of Alma, chap. 9:2.) "Unto you" (the Twelve) says Jesus, "it is given to know the *mysteries* of the kingdom, but to them that are without, to speak in parables." And again, "I have many things to say unto you, but ye are not able to bear them now." Some of the leaders of the Reorganization have said all along: "I was well acquainted with Joseph the prophet and seer and he never taught *me* anything savoring of polygamy." Indeed? Why your whole subsequent career is a pretty good argument that it would be anything but wisdom to teach *you* any of the mysteries of the kingdom of God. Men who are so full of their traditions, and hold them up as a standard as to what God should reveal, and what he should not; and imagine that they know better than the prophet of God himself whether his revelations are true or false, are altogether too wise for the church and kingdom of God; and just why such very wise men should ever think of joining that church is a mystery. What need of prophets of God where such men as they are?

Says Joseph the Seer: "Many men will say I will never forsake you, but will stand by you at all times. But the moment you teach them some of the *mysteries* of the kingdom of God that are retained in the heavens and are to be revealed to the children of men when they are *prepared for them*, they will be the first to stone you and put you to

death. It was *this same principle* that crucified the Lord Jesus Christ and will cause the people to kill the prophets in this generation." Undoubtedly! And they are the very class of men who did cause that very thing to be done, both on the part of Joseph and Hyrum Smith and James J. Strang. The Laws and the Higbys and the Fosters and the Gurleys and the Razys and the Newkirks and the Powerses and the Briggses and others may not think themselves guilty of their blood either before or after the fact, but we are willing to leave it to the day of righteous judgment. I shall send a copy of this tract to every anti-Strangite whose address I can find and I demand of them right here that they bring forth their strong reasons against these things, from the

Law and the Testimony of Jesus Christ. And I want them also to bring forth their strong arguments against anything else which Mr. Strang is accused of teaching, or which they may think he has taught either by revelation or translation. Don't be like "the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear and refuses to hear the voice of the charmer, though charming never so wisely." I want you to point out those errors and answer them, if any such there are, and send them marked if you are running a paper, to me and if not send them in written words by pen and ink.

My address is Lyons, Wis.

Truly,

WINGFIELD WATSON.

April 18, 1903.

78 yps 22

See p 25

